UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,323	12/20/2004	Masazumi Nishikawa	263192US0PCT	3573
	350 7590 06/25/2009 BLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.		EXAMINER	
1940 DUKE STREET			MERCIER, MELISSA S	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1615	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/25/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/517,323	NISHIKAWA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	MELISSA S. MERCIER	1615
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY OF THE MAILING I	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tired will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 and 2an This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 18,19,22,25-36 and 39-41 is/are per 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 18-19, 22, 25-36, and 39-41 is/are is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E 	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Bure: * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/517,323 Page 2

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Summary

Receipt of Applicants Remarks and Amended Claims filed on February 27, 2009 is acknowledged. Claims 18-19, 22, 25-36, and 39-41 remain under prosecution in this application.

Withdrawn Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The rejection of claims 40-41 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention has been withdrawn in view of Applicants

Amendment to the claims to change "composition" to "method", thereby correcting the antecedent basis in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The rejection of claims 18-19, 22, 25-36, and 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al. (US Patent 5,602,183) in view of Norwegian Shark Oil product information sheet has been withdrawn. Applicant's arguments regarding the "topical" administration via oral administration are persuasive. There is no expectation based on the teachings of Martin that an oral administration would serve as a skin protection/wound healing composition.

Newly Applied Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 18-19, 22, 25-36, and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brohuit et al. EP 0321428) in view of Ecomer product information sheet.

Brohuit discloses the use of glycerol ethers in dermatological diseases. The glycerol ethers can be administered orally in the form of capsules and is sold under the TradeName Ecomer (abstract). Ecomer is Shark Liver Oil, see attached product information sheet. The glycerols are present as diesters of fatty acids (column 1, lines 45-48). The capsules contain 0.05g of active substance, thereby meeting the limitation of claim 19. The capsules also contain gelatin and glyercol, which would meet the limitation of claim 31.

Applicant's disclosure on page 8 discloses a method for extracting diacylglyceryl ether, triglycerides, and squalene from shark liver oil. Therefore, it is the examiners position that the use of shark liver oil would inherently possess the ether compound, as well as triglycerides and squalene, in the amounts recited in claim 39, and thus the administration of shark liver oil meets the limitations of the instant claims.

Burns caused by intensive sunrays can be partly prevented by administration (column 1, lines 56-58).

Regarding claim 40-41, the claim limitations are considered to be product by process limitations. Since the prior art discloses the same product used for the same

Art Unit: 1615

purpose, the process from which it is made does not hold patentable weight. Applicant's attention is directed to MPEP 2113, which discloses, "[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Burden is shifted to Applicant to provide a patentable distinction between the administration of the shark liver oils of the prior art and that of the instant claims.

Brohuit does not particularly disclose skin cancer induced by UV light, formation of pigmented spots induced by UV light, formation of freckles induced by UV light, formation of wrinkles induced by UV light, formation of verrucae induced by UV light, and formation of erythema induced by UV light as recited in claims 32-36. Martin additionally does not disclose the daily dosage of the composition.

Regarding the dosages recited in claims 19, 25-26, 30, it is the position of the examiner that one of ordinary skill in this art would have the knowledge for determining optimum dosing schedules of the composition in order to obtain the optimum therapeutic effect of the compound.

Regarding the specific conditions of claims 32-36, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used the composition of Brohuit for the treatment of UV light induced skin damage since it is disclosed that the ethers beneficially influence diseases depending upon epidermal growth. Since the prior art discloses the composition can be used to treat UV induced skin damage, it would have been obvious

Application/Control Number: 10/517,323 Page 5

Art Unit: 1615

to one of ordinary skill in the art to attempt treatment utilizing the composition for the instantly claimed disorders since they all arise from the same origin.

Conclusion

Due to the new grounds of rejection presented in this office action, this action is made Non-Final. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELISSA S. MERCIER whose telephone number is (571)272-9039. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:30pm Mon through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melissa S Mercier/ Examiner, Art Unit 1615 /MP WOODWARD/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615